REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7-9, 27 and 28 are presented for consideration, with Claims 1, 9, 27 and 28 being independent.

Independent Claims 1 and 9 have been amended to further distinguish Applicants' invention from the cited art. In addition, Claims 27 and 28 have been added to provide an additional scope of protection.

Initially, Claim 8 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite. In response to this rejection, Claim 1 has been amended to include "display means." Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 9, 10 and 12 are understood to be rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 (and not §102(e) as indicated in the Office Action) as being unpatentable over Hamilton '874 in view of Toffolo '247. The remaining claims stand rejected as allegedly being obvious over the Hamilton/Toffolo combination of art and further in view of Abe (JP '889) (Claim 5), Dimitrova '123 (Claim 7), and Dimitrova and Ward '424 (Claim 8). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 of Applicants' invention relates to an image processing apparatus comprised of an input unit for inputting video image data, an icon image generation unit for generating icon image data, and a control unit for determining a display position of the icon image. In addition, a display control unit superimposes one of the video image and the icon

image on the other and displays the video and icon images on display means such that the icon image is positioned in the display position determined by the control unit, and a synchronous signal transform unit transforms a synchronous signal. As amended, the control unit determines successively a plurality of display positions different from each other as display positions of the icon image by controlling the icon image generation unit and the synchronous signal transform unit so as to read, from the icon image generation unit, the icon image data based on a transformed synchronous signal with a predetermined delay time.

Claim 9 relates to an image processing method and corresponds generally to Claim 1. Claim 9 thus includes a control step to successively determine a plurality of display positions from each other as display positions of the icon image by controlling an icon image generation step and a synchronous signal transform step so as to read the generated icon image data based on a transformed synchronous signal with a predetermined delay time.

Support for the claim amendments can be found, for example, on page 7, line 21, *et. seq.*, of the specification. In accordance with Applicants' claimed invention, a high performance image processing apparatus and method can be provided.

The primary citation to Hamilton relates to a method for reducing phosphor burning of a CRT monitor screen by periodically changing the location of textural information overlaid onto a video image. The Office Action takes the position that Hamilton determines successively a plurality of display positions different from each other as display positions of an

icon image according to a predetermined shift pattern, but acknowledges that Hamilton does not expressly teach using an accumulated display time for each shift pattern.

The secondary citation to Toffolo was cited to compensate for the deficiency in Hamilton. In Toffolo, illuminated pixels of an image 30 in a display 22 are controlled by a display controller. The display controller controls the image to be displayed in a first position for a first predetermined time period, first and second positions for a predetermined time period, and then in a second position for a second predetermined time period.

In contrast to Applicants' claimed invention, however, neither Hamilton nor Toffolo teach or suggest, among other features, successively determining a plurality of display positions different from each other by reading generated icon image data based on a transformed synchronous signal with a predetermined delay time. The proposed combination of art, even if proper, thus still fails to teach or suggest Applicants' claimed invention as set forth in Claims 1 and 9. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 1, 2, 4, 9, 10 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. §103 is respectfully requested.

The tertiary citation to Abe relates to a display controller having a screen saver and is relied upon for its teaching of generating arbitrary images or animations.

The tertiary citation to Dimitrova relates to a television receiver having a "smart" picture-in-picture (PIP), and is relied upon for teaching the resizing of an icon image.

The tertiary citation to Ward relates to a system for modifying advertisement information on a display and is cited for its teaching of the use of icon menus and other items in various windows having a user-adjustable position size and content.

The tertiary citations fail, however, to compensate for the deficiencies in the art discussed above with respect to Applicants' independent Claims 1 and 9. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of the remaining rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103 are respectfully requested.

Accordingly, it is submitted that Applicants' invention as set forth in independent Claims 1 and 9 is patentable over the cited art. In addition, dependent Claims 2, 4, 5, 7 and 8 set forth additional features of Applicants' invention. Independent consideration of the dependent claims is respectfully requested.

New Claims 27 and 28 are also submitted to be patentable over the cited art. Support these claims can be found, for example, on page 19, line 6, *et. seq.*, of the specification.

In Claim 27, an image processing apparatus includes an input unit for inputting video image data, an icon image generation unit for generating icon image data, a control unit for determining a display position of the icon image, and a display control unit for superimposing one of the video image and the icon image on the other and displaying the video and icon images on a monitor such that the icon image is positioned in the display position determined by the control unit. In addition, a memory unit stores the video and the icon image data, and an address transforming unit transforms address data. The control step determines successively a plurality

of display positions different from each other as display positions of the icon image by controlling the memory unit and the address transforming unit so as to write the icon image data to the memory unit with a predetermined amount of shifted address.

Claim 28 relates to an image processing method and corresponds generally to Claim 27.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of this application is deemed to be in order and such action is respectfully requested.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Washington, D.C. office by telephone at (202) 530-1010. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

/Scott D. Malpede/

Scott D. Malpede
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 32,533

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

SDM\rnm

FCHS_WS 1529996v1